UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/787,376	02/26/2004	Daniel John Devine	Devine 2-2	4422	
	7590 05/12/200 N & LEWIS, LLP	EXAMINER			
1300 POST RO	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		VIDWAN, JASJIT S		
SUITE 205 FAIRFIELD, C	Т 06824		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2182		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/12/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/787,376	DEVINE, DANIEL JOHN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JASJIT S. VIDWAN	2182	

	LXUIIIICI	Ait Oille						
	JASJIT S. VIDWAN	2182						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Continued Examination (RCE).	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request					
periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
NOTICE OF APPEAL	" " OT OFF 44 OT 41	6 0 1 20 2 4 4 4						
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further colling they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause					
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			,					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 			_					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the control of the contro		l be entered and an e	xplanation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).					
10. 🛮 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
1. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation.</u>								
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
/Tariq Hafiz/	/J. S. V./							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2182	Examiner, Art Unit 2182							

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 10 & 11: Although the Applicant improves on its earlier submitted 131 Affidavit, the evidence submitted still remain insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Chen reference. More particularly, Applicant fails to show sufficient diligence from the time of conception to the filing date. As per MPEP 2138.06, it is noted that even "a 2-day period lacking activity has been held to be fatal..." By that standard, large gaps remain in Applicant's dilegence from conception on May 13th, 2003 to submission to Agere IP on July 11, 2003 (approximately 2 months). Further, following October 15th 2003 evidence wherein a letter was sent to Ryan, mason & lewis, LLP, no further action was taken until January 12th 2004 meeting by Mr. Mason and Devine (approximately 3 months).

Without highlighting further examples of lack of evidence supporting diligence, it is the position of the Examiner that use of Chen reference is proper.